## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 and 13-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 16, 21, 23 and 25 are amended, claim 12 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 29-31 are added. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-22 and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,929,849 to Kikinis. The Office Action also rejects claims 7, 14 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0184627 to Alba et al. (hereafter Alba). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a broadcast service provider transmitting broadcast signals of each broadcast program including region information and specific information for each region, the region information indicating a region whereby specific information exists and the specific information including a plurality of information data relating to an object included within a specific region.

Kikinis does not teach or suggest all these features. More specifically, Kikinis does not suggest that a broadcasting service provider transmitting signals including region information and specific information for each region where the specific information includes a plurality of information data relating to an object included within a specific region. In rejecting claim 12, the Office Action references Kikinis' col. 6, lines 50-67; col. 7, lines 1-18 and 38-67; and col. 8, lines 1-37. However, these sections merely relate to a WWW URL being provided regarding a particular item (such as a BMW emblem). Kikinis has no suggestion for a plurality of

information data relating to an object included within a specific region. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

Independent claim 5 recites a broadcast service provider transmitting broadcast signals of each broadcast program including region information and specific information for each region, the specific information including a plurality of information data relating to an object included within a specific region. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Kikinis does not teach or suggest all these features. Thus, independent claim 5 defines patentable subject matter.

Additionally, independent claim 11 recites receiving a broadcasting signal representative of an image, where the broadcasting signal including position information of at least one interactive region within the image and supplemental information preassigned to the interactive image region. Independent claim 1 further recites that the supplemental information includes a plurality of information data related to an object to be provided in the interactive image region. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Kikinis does not teach or suggest all these features. Thus, independent claim 11 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 16 recites changing a shape or color of a cursor when the cursor is positioned within the at least one interactive region and the address of the Internet Web site exists regarding an item within the at least one interactive region.

In addressing claims 7, 14 and 23, the Office Action states that Kikinis does not disclose changing a shape or color of the cursor when specific information exists in the region of the screen where the cursor is positioned. The Office Action then relies on Alba's page 6, paragraphs 93 and 94 for the missing features. However, Alba discloses the pointer/cursor 110

changes to indicate alternate or additional information. Alba discusses that this change occurs when the program matrix 108 is to be shifted by an entire page. This does not suggest changing a color or shape when the cursor is within the at least one interactive region and the address of the Internet Web site exists regarding an item within the at least one interactive region. Rather, in Alba, the configuration may change to indicate information that is not provided within the current region of the pointer/cursor 110. Accordingly, Alba does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 16. Thus, independent claim 16 defines patentable subject matter.

Additionally, applicant questions the U.S. effective filing date of Alba. Alba's cover sheet states that Alba has a filing date of May 28, 2002. If Alba's filing date is May 28, 2002, then Alba is not prior art to the present application. Alba's cover sheet also references Application No. 09/032,374, filed February 27, 1998 (as well as a provisional application). However, the first line of Alba's specification does not state that the application (of the published Alba document) is a continuation application. Therefore, Alba does not appear to properly claim priority from a parent application prior to May 28, 2002.

Even further, independent claim 21 recites a tuner receiving a broadcasting signal representative of an image, the broadcasting signal including position information of at least one interactive region within the image and supplemental information preassigned to the interactive image region, the supplemental information including a plurality of informational data related to an object to be provided in the interactive image region. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Kikinis does not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 21 defines patentable subject matter.

Still further, independent claim 25 recites a microprocessor generating control signals for displaying the received contents of the Web site on the display screen, wherein the microprocessor changes a shape or color of a cursor when the cursor is positioned within the interactive image region. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Kikinis and Alba do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 25. Thus, independent claim 25 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claim 1, 5, 11, 16, 21 and 25 define patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references. For example, dependent claim 8 recites displaying indexes on the regions defined by the region information among the regions of the screen and selecting a desired index from among the displayed indexes. See also dependent claims 30-31. The Office Action references Kikinis' FIG. 2C and col. 8, lines 1-22. However, these sections discuss a window 71 that may be displayed after accessing a WEB page. This does not suggest displaying indexes on the regions defined by the region information among regions of the screen or selecting a desired index. Thus, dependent claim 8 (and similarly dependent claims 30-31) defines patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-31 are

earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3701 DCO/kah

Date: January 18, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610